

REMARKS:

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated November 17, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakatsuka et al, and rejected claims 2, 3, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakatsuka et al and Wikipedia. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Nakatsuka

Nakatsuka includes only one controller: a PID speed controller 2, which has two inputs: estimated moment of inertia and difference between a detected speed and a speed command. Speed controller 2 outputs a current command which is used to control torque of the motor 1.

Inventive claim 6

includes the limitation that the motor control unit calculates a current command based on the estimated inertia moment and an acceleration command. The Examiner did not even attempt to point out an element in Nakatsuka corresponding to the inventive acceleration command; that is because there is none. The acceleration command is described in the specification as being a given value (see at least paragraph [0030]); no such thing is disclosed or suggested in Nakatsuka, whose current command is based only on speed. For at least this reason, claim 6, as well as its dependents, claims 7-10, is patentable over Nakatsuka.

Inventive claim 1

In addition to the limitation of the acceleration command as argued above, claim 1 is further patentable over Nakatsuka due to the limitation that a final current command is calculated based on the speed controller output current and the forward compensation current, both of which are calculated based on the acceleration command. The Examiner did not even attempt to point out elements in Nakatsuka corresponding to the inventive forward compensation current or final current command. Nakatsuka only contains one current command (output of speed controller 2), which is disclosed as controlling the torque of the motor 1 (abstract lines 3-10). In contrast, inventive claim 1 has a final current command, which controls the motor, calculated based on the speed controller output command and the

forward compensation current. For at least this reason, in addition to that argued above, claim 1, as well as its dependents, claims 2-5, is patentable over Nakatsuka.

Conclusions

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Authorization is granted to charge any outstanding fees due at this time for the continued prosecution of this matter to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Deposit Account No. 50-0310 (matter no. 060944-0145).

Respectfully submitted,



Jessica C. Stahnke (Reg. No. 57,570)

for

Thomas D. Kohler (Reg. No. 32,797)

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

One Market, Spear Street Tower

San Francisco, CA 94105

415.442.1000

February 17, 2006

Date